DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 030 FL 015 802

AUTHOR Raimes, Ann
TITLE Teaching Writing: What We Know and What We Do.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (20th, Anaheim, CA, March 3-8, 1986).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; Content Analysis; *Educational Theories; *English (Second Language); *Language Processing; Literature Reviews; Textbook Content; *Textbooks; Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction

ABSTRACT

Recent research on writing that sheds light on writing instruction in English as a second language (ESL) focuses on contrastive rhetoric (the interference of first language rhetoric experienced by the second language learner), patterns of development in English scientific texts that cause problems for second language readers, the contrastive use of other text features, and error patterns. As the focus in writing instruction turned from product to process, the emphasis has turned away from the teaching of grammar and prescribed patterns of organization. This has been interpreted by some as a shift away from rigor and as a split between form and content and between grammatical accuracy and fluency. The two approaches, however, can be reconciled. A review of 10 recent ESL writing textbooks reveals no real change in approach. Rather, there is a continued traditional emphasis on prescribed form, enhanced by a few prewriting strategies and group activities intended to focus on process. This survey makes clear that current theory about writing instruction has not been fully translated into practice. Writing teachers would find it helpful to have a comprehensive theory of the acquisition of writing ability and instructional materials that attend to concerns about product in the context of a process approach to writing. Some indications on a textbook analysis are appended. Included are the features examined and bibliographic information on the textbooks. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ann Raimes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED271030

TEACHING WRITING: WHAT WE KNOW AND WHAT WE DO

Ann Raimes

Hunter College, City University of New York

The last ten years have been exciting times for teachers of writing. But exciting developments in research and theory don't always lead to clearcut classroom procedures (witness Chomsky), and in fact, the excitement of changing times and, as Kuhn calls it, changing paradigms (1970), often results in a torrent of problems, a flood of uncertainty, a sea of confusion. It is these problems, this uncertainty, and this confusion that I want to examine today. I'll do this by addressing four questions: 1. What do we know about composing in a second language? 2. What are the problems we face--and what do we need to know? 3. What do our textbooks tell us to do in the classroom? (subtitled: from theory to confusion) and 4. How can we make what we do fit what we know?

Paper presented at International TESOL Convention in Anaheim, California, March 1986. Shorter version presented at Annual Meeting of Conference on College Composition and Communication, New Orleans, LA, March 1986.

FL015802

The most long-standing and best established body of research in ESL composition examines written products, the words and sentences on the page. If you look at the first part of your handout, you'll see that I've listed some of the important published research studies that have examined written products. These fall into four categories, which I'll descibe briefly.

Basically, what they tell us is this. First, they tell us about contrastive rhetoric, the interference of L1 rhetoric for an L2 learner. Linguistically determined cultural preferences in L1 writing are seen to "cause difficulties for non-native speakers writing in a target language" (Kaplan 1983:3) so teachers need to teach explicitly the cultural and discourse conventions of English. (Some studies, however, find no "transfer of culture-specific rhetorical patterns " (Connor and McCagg 1983). Second, this product research also tells us about the patterns of development (the formal schemata) in English scientific texts that cause difficulties for L2 readers: particularly the given-new pattern of topic development, and the implicit "presuppositional" information (information the writer assumes the reader shares) contained in the text (Selinker, Todd-Trimble, and Trimble 1976, 1978). Researchers suggest we teach specific text patterns to ISL students (Weissberg 1984).

Third, the research tells us about other text features such as the use (or omission) of cohesive devices, rhetorical connections, or attention-getting devices. Researchers examine how L1 and L2 writers use these features and for the most part conclude that L2 writers are more limited and need to be taught how to use the features. And finally, these researchers tell us a lot about error. They examine specific languages for the interference errors they produce; Lay, for example, examines Chinese (1975). They survey faculty members' response to error, finding a hierarchy of sentence level errors, the least acceptable being word order errors, the omission of it, and tense errors (Vann et al. 1984). However, here researchers also see errors as part of the process of language learning, as arising from learners' active strategies (Corder 1967, Kroll and Schafer 1978) and from the learners' stage of development of acquisition of the target language (Richards 1971).

Up until ten years ago, such research was all we had. Influenced by its emphasis on the differences between L1 and L2 products, we emphasized products in the classroom, too, and tried to drill the English patterns of rhetoric, cohesion, and grammar, hoping to avoid L1 interference with those patterns. We knew what prose looked like in English. We saw how English prose was linear in its development, so we taught patterns of linearity that contrasted with L1

patterns. In teaching the product, though, we made the process linear, too: first write the topic sentence and then fit everything else to it. We abstracted what we saw as teachable patterns of form, and presented them like cookie-cutter shapes: all our students had to do was to pour in the batter of their own content and we could then show them quite precisely where they had missed or been sloppy. We knew about the kinds of errors our students made, too, so we taught grammar to help them spot the errors or we gave writing assignments that were so structured that students could sidestep all that wicked L1 interference and avoid error totally. When that failed, we wielded our red pens like spears to attack the dragon Error (and to show how conscientious we were). So we can say that we built our class around an abstraction of a "good" written product. The teaching climate under this paradigm is summed up by a sentence about composition evaluation which appears in a respected teacher-training book not only in its first, but also in its second and third edition, the last of which came out in 1986: the author tells us to deduct points for errors in spelling, punctuation, structure, and vocabulary, conceding that "you may prefer, if ideas are important, to give two points for ideas. If you think four ideas are necessary, give 1/2 a point for each" (Finocchiaro 88).

It was precisely concern about ideas that made us uneasy about our teaching then. After we'd shown students

how to use an English pattern of development and cohesive devices and how to fix up the grammar, why were their free compositions often so--dare we say it-- formulaic, dull and lifeless? We knew our students had interesting and original ideas, but why did they never seem to emerge in a composition beginning with "Computers have changed our society in three ways..."?

The vague feelings of discontent some of us had were then fuelled by a new thrust in research: influenced by developments in native language composition, researchers turned their attention to looking not just at the writing on the page but at the writers as they wrote, observing them, interviewing them, videotaping them, measuring the length of pauses, asking them to compose aloud and coding all their activities, all this in an effort to discover how the words got on to the page.

A profile of ESL writers emerged. Part 2 of the handout (on p.3) lists the frequently cited published ESL "process" studies which contribute to this profile. (You'll see that it's confined to the 1980s and it's much shorter than the product list.) The picture shown by this research is <u>not</u> one of L2 writers fighting against the rhetorical and linguistic patterns of L1. It is more like this: ESL writers use strategies similar to the ones native speakers use (Zamel 1983). They explore and discover ideas through

writing, just as native speakers do. Their planning skills are similar, and planning skills in L1 transfer to L2 (Jones and Tetroe 1985). They will not necessarily know what they are going to say before they start to write, and the act of writing itself can help them find that out (Zamel 1982). They think as they write and writing aids thinking. They interact and negotiate with the emerging text, their own intentions, and their sense of the reader (Raimes 1985). They also negotiate between L1 and L2 to create their meaning. Knowledge of L1 writing helps form hypotheses in L2 writing (Edelsky 1982) and sometimes writers use L1 to help when composing in L2 (Lay 1982). In short, these researchers found that, in this complex cognitive task of writing, the difficulties of ESL writers stem less from the contrasts between L1 and L2 and from the linguistic features of the new language than from the constraints of the act of composing itself.

Notice that this research while finding similarities between L1 and L2 composition has specifically looked for similarities; questions about the differences between L1 and L2 writers are only just beginning to be asked (Raimes 1985). Only occasionally, too, have researchers looked at differences among the huge and diverse group of ESL students Jones has noted differences in composing behaviors for a Monitor overuser and underuser (1985), and Zamel and Raimes record different levels of concern with

error that unskilled writers show compared with skilled writers (Zamel 1983, Raimes 1985); however, at issue here might be lack of a clear definition of what it means to be "unskilled."

This new focus on the writer writing instead of on the writing on the page led to the idea that in the classroom we should be teaching the strategies that skilled writers use to reach their goals. So our literature recommends journals, freewriting, brainstorming, students' choice of topics, teaching heuristics (devices for invention), multiple drafts, revisions, group work, peer conferencing, and supportive feedback, and turns away from what have come to be seen as "product" activities: the teaching of grammar and of prescribed patterns of organization.

WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS WE FACE--AND WHAT DO WE NEED TO KNOW?

The two concerns of product and process seem so far apart that to some teachers they seem almost irreconcilable. Teachers tend to identify with one camp or another, or nervously stick to one and include a bit of the other for safety's sake. This apparent swing of the pendulum in the product/process paradigm shift has produced three fundamental dichotomies that trouble writing teachers.

First, the product/process shift has been equated with

control vs. freedom or rigor vs. looseness. Some teachers have heard and read so much about journals and freewriting that they equate process with a kind of sixties touchy-feely approach, in which no real work or real teaching is done. They can't see how such an approach can be used in a program with fixed requirements and constraints of a syllabus. They can't see how their students can learn about paragraph form if they do not give them the forms. Similarly, they see a process approach as focusing on personal writing, emotional outpourings, "letting it all hang out," the very opposite of the academic writing they want to train their students to do. The "process" enthusiasts, on the other hand, view the "product" emphasis on form and grammar as confining, restrictive, teacher-centered, unproductive, and deadly dull.

Second, the shift has led to an unfortunate dichotomy of form vs. content. Because a process approach implies that content precedes and dictates form, it questions the teaching of <u>abstract</u> patterns of form. In a radical transformation, though, process is sometimes viewed as attentive only to content and meaning, with content running rampant over form, and thus seen as antithetical to form.

Third, we find lots of evidence of a dichotomy between grammatical accuracy and fluency. In another radical transformation, product has been equated with grammar:

directors of ESL programs wonder whether we can afford the time "to do process and grammar," and a conference presentation pointing out the need for teaching grammatical accuracy has been called a "backlash against process." These opposing positions are reinforced by teachers who, devoted to their concept of "the process approach," say they never teach grammar in writing classes. And this worries teachers whose students fail writing proficiency tests because of their grammar errors.

The shift means, then, that for many teachers content is seen to be at odds with form, fluency is seen to be at odds with accuracy and with proficiency, and writing as finding one's own meaning is seen to be a quirk, a funny little extra we can include if we don't have more important things to do. Such product/process dichotomies have not been productive. For what we should be talking about is not which one of these two extremes to use, but how to include the best of both, how to do it all, and how to do it all well. That's no mean task. We need to know how to stop this pendulum swing, to resolve these dichotomies and to pay attention to both process and product in our classroom. That's what a real process approach does: it doesn't neglect product concerns, but rather it approaches them by means of the students' process instead of by means of the teacher's prescriptions.

How do we do that? Let's turn now to practice.

WHAT DO OUR TEXTBOOKS TELL US TO DO IN THE CLASSROOM?--or, from theory to confusion

Before I go on to say how I see these troublesome dichotomies as reconcilable and what I see as a workable approach to process and product in a classroom, we'll look at some examples of material from recent textbooks to see how the shift emerges in recommended practice. I've examined ten recent ESL writing textbooks published since 1983 (listed on p.4 of the handout) to find out what effect the emphasis on process in research and theory has really had on practice and what activities are prescribed for the classroom in the face of all these dichotomies. As a frame of reference, I've asked three questions that the product-process shift generates: first, how much attention do these new books pay to developing what Krashen calls "an efficient composing process," which he sees as necessary for the development of performance in writing (1984:41)? Here, given time constraints, I'll look only at pre-writing and revising activities. Second, how do they present the relationship between form and content? Third, how do they deal with grammar? Pages 5-6 of the handout show what I found.

First, what is evident in these ten books of the

emphasis in research and theory on the need to allow students time and opportunity to generate ideas? How much attention is given to pre-writing? In five out of the ten books, nothing, no examples or exercises, or nothing more than a short appendix, for example, on "Process" (Kaplan) or on "The Journal" (Reid), or a parenthetical paragraph telling students to first determine if they prefer brainstorming or outlining. In these five books, the word is that the basic rules of writing are to "write about what you know about" (Reid 41) or to "plan out your composition before you start writing" (Blanton 20). So writing is presented largely as demonstration rather than discovery of ideas. It's interesting to note, though, that two of these books nevertheless include the word "Process" in the title!

The other five books include some pre-writing activities, for the most part freewriting tasks (in 3), brainstorming tasks (in 4), directions to ask questions about a topic (in 3), and journal writing (in 3). Only in one of these latter three books is the journal writing regular rather than incidental and integrated with the other writing tasks (Tucker); here the journal is used as the major heuristic device, and students are shown how it can be used to develop ideas for academic assignments. And only one of the ten books leads the learners systematically through a whole variety of heuristic devices, from Aristotle to Elbow (Hartfiel).

If the research on the writing process has influenced classroom materials, then we would expect our textbooks to include not only pre-writing but also revising. However, six of the ten books either make no mention of revising or at most include a one or two-page checklist of guidelines for students to apply to their own writing. The other four include more comprehensive or frequent but still rather global advice applicable to any piece of writing; in one book (Tucker), for example, the revision chapter consists of an example of a revised piece of professional writing (actually, it's by Nabokov, the ESL writer par excellence) followed by some all-purpose questions about form to apply to one's own piece of writing. Of these four books, three suggest peer group work before the student revises, but only one suggests teacher input before revision. Three of the ten books provide directions for revising with each assignment. One does this in the form of a Composition Profile sheet (the same one with every piece of writing), which leads students through the process of evaluating their own and each others' papers (Hartfiel). The other two provide a revision section in every chapter, but even here advice is global and very general--so much so that one book includes the same questions after each assignment ("Is there more to add? words to change?") (Blass and Pike-Baky), while the other uses exactly the same wording for its revision section, in chapter after chapter for 20 chapters, throughout the whole book (Cramer). So students--and

teachers-- are left with a sense of deja vu and, presumably, the idea that revising is abstractly formulaic and predictable.

Let's look now at the relationship of form to content in these books. What are the students asked to write about and what assumptions are made about form preceding content or content generating form? In at least half of these books, students are given a form and asked to fit some content into it, either given content or their own. A typical task is this: students read an essay on "Attitudes Towards Money," one which very precisely illustrates classification. Then they use that form as a model to write an essay classifying people's attitudes towards work or travel (Smalley 230). Nine of the ten books rely quite heavily on reading passages with exercises attached to tell their readers about organization; some of these use samples of professional/academic writing, some use student samples, some use passages written specifically to illustrate an abstraction of a rhetorical mode for the textbook chapter. Often the pieces are author-written or even student-written according to a prescribed format, which means that their original purpose was not to communicate ideas but to illustrate form--an abstract idea of form. Thus they lack a sense of real purpose and real audience. Sometimes, the task is more prescribed: the students are given not just a topic and a form to imitate, but are actually given a topic

sentence to develop: "If I had a two-week vacation, I would go to_____ because... (Reid 81). Or the shape of the whole piece is graphically prescribed: in one book, essay organization is shown as a goblet shape that students have to imitate and squeeze their content into. Occasionally, the writer's expression of meaning is even more drastically curtailed: in one practice exercise, students are given 12 sentences describing a coffee cup and a measuring cup. Their task is to rearrange and combine the sentences or add to them (the creative touch) and to write a paragraph comparing the two cups (Cobb p.72). The sense of purpose and audience that is of concern in a real process approach is conspicuous by its absence here. For why would anyone ever need or want to read, let alone write, a comparison of a coffee cup and a measuring cup?

Those examples show us tasks firmly rooted in the traditional paradigm. Sometimes, when a new approach is tried, there is a clash: let me now give an example from a book (Blass and Pike-Baky) which professes in its Preface to present "a systematic approach to the writing <u>process</u>" (my italics) and makes its chapters theme-based and content-based presumably to avoid the tyranny of form. But we have to look closely. The activities are not really content-based at all. Despite a nod to content and process in brainstorming and freewriting exercises included in every chapter, the authors' true views of form/content come

through in the following exercise: They present two topic sentences:

1. The French are famous for their love of liberty, equality, and brotherhood.
2. The French are famous for their love of liberty.

Then they ask us which one has only one idea and is ipso facto better. Their answer: Number 2. They reveal here that their view of the paragraph is abstract, not content-specific. They want form to precede content. For surely a topic sentence cannot be seen as better or worse outside the paragraph it goes with. And the authors themselves tacitly acknowledge this when, five pages later, we are asked to read a paragraph and then choose the most appropriate topic sentence from three possibilities given. And, sure enough, one paragraph is about direct eye contact and firm handshakes. Count them: not just one but two ideas! So here we need to choose the topic sentence that includes the two ideas. Counting ideas certainly seems fraught with dangers.

We see, then, that the research and theory on the writing process has not had much impact on our textbooks, at least not in the view that content should precede and determine form. Only one book provides systematic sets of heuristics to help writers explore formal options with a specific assignment (Hartfiel). And only one grabs the process pendulum with enough conviction to swing with it all the way and omit any reference to organizational

considerations at all (Cramer).

Our last question about the ten books: how do they deal with grammar? They seem to do this in two ways: either in a block or ad hoc. In three of the books, grammar is seen as a set of conventions to be reviewed separately from writing, so it is handled in a block--but very differently in each case. One book includes an extensive handbook of 150 pages (Cobb) and occasional exhortations to refer to handbook sections after an assignment has been completed. Another provides a survey of punctuation and sentence structure in the two introductory chapters (Reid) (verbs and articles are, oddly, ignored in this book for ESL students), while the third, believing that students "pick up grammar on their own" (Cramer v) merely provides the same editing checklist for each assignment, referring students in each case to a nine-page appendix for examples of common errors and their corrections.

In 7 of the 10 books (Blass and D., Blass and P-B, Blanton, Smalley, Kaplan, Hartfiel, Tucker), the authors have, I suspect, been more influenced by the idea of "process" and have incorporated grammatical items along with the writing activities and assignments in the book. So grammar occurs and recurs as rules, examples, exercises (often sentence fill-ins), and explanations of points illustrated in the readings or anticipated in the writing

assigned. Here, then, grammar is associated with a block of subject matter, as it occurs, ad hoc. It appears, on the surface, to be integrated into the process of writing: that is, deal with the grammar as you go along. An actual illustration from one book shows some problems with this: in this book, pronouns occur in Chapter 9 (Tucker) presumably since some kind of tenuous connection is seen between pronoun use and analyzing causes and effects (the rhetorical theme of the chapter). The section contains explanations and sentence exercises but there is no application to the students' own writing that has been assigned in that chapter. Here, as in most of the other books I surveyed, grammar marches alongside the writing process but is not integrated into it. It is as much an abstract set of rules and exercises as we find in a handbook.

This survey of ten recent textbooks reveals no clear indication of a changing paradigm. The dominant approach is, on the whole, still a traditional one, with an emphasis on prescribed form, and the presentation of models of organization and of accuracy. The recent emphasis on process peeks in occasionally with the introduction of a few pre-writing strategies and some group activities to broaden readership. Only one or two of the books make a consistent attempt to expose the students to the strategies of developing their composing processes, but they might neglect too many of the product concerns for some of us. So, given

all of this variety in new textbooks, our next question becomes crucial:

HOW DO WE MAKE WHAT WE DO FIT WHAT WE KNOW?

My purpose in looking at these books in this way has not been to point out their flaws, but to point out how little concerted practical effect the theoretical movement towards process has actually had on our resources. Also, my purpose has been to point out how important it is for us teachers not to rely on a textbook author to interpret theoretical change for us and put it into practice. First we need instead to form and articulate for ourselves our own philosophy of teaching writing so that we establish our criteria before we select a book and a teaching design. We should not just assume, as I hope I have shown, that a new textbook, with "process" in the title or including some journal and freewriting exercises is necessarily the work of a theorist who understands process as a total approach, not as a trendy addendum. We also shouldn't assume that a traditional book is out of touch with current theory: it could well be that its author has chosen to address the book to a particular audience of programs, students, and teachers for whom formal considerations are more important. After we have articulated for ourselves what we want our classes and our textbooks to do, then we need to examine books very closely to see how they fit in with or can be adapted to the

theoretical underpinnings we have chosen.

Our search would be helped if we had a comprehensive theory of the acquisition of writing ability. Krashen makes a beginning by pointing to yet another dichotomy in both L1 and L2 learners: the distinction between competence and performance in writing. He sees competence as acquired from "large amounts of self-motivated reading for interest and/or pleasure" (1984: 20) while performance is helped by writing practice. Comprehensible input, so the argument goes, contributes more to language acquisition than does instruction, so the development of print code literacy in our students is more effective than dealing with L1/L2 contrasts in grammar exercises or practicing organizational patterns.

However attractive that theory is to us, and however solidly it is based on the research available, practical considerations come into play. Those of us in college classrooms, in particular, do not have the luxury of years of pleasure reading to build up our students' competence. Often all we have is one or two semesters. Until any far-reaching reforms are made in the educational system and in society at large, we still have to teach our writing course and try to build up competence in a short time. To help us do that, we need to know what shortcuts we can take. We need, then, to form our own operational definition of

writing and writing ability as it applies to our students, their goals, and the constraints of our institution. First, we have to characterize our students to assess how efficient their composing processes already are and how much writing practice they need: Are they literate in L1? Do they have in L1 or in L2 the established composing processes characteristic of skilled writers? Second, we have to look at course goals. If the students in our program are to be tested and judged on how well they can reproduce a standard organizational pattern, such as a business letter, memo, or scientific report, perhaps an emphasis on writing to create meaning is misplaced and patterns and models are what are needed. And this is the rationale for many of the academic product-oriented books on the market.

However, that kind of program and those kinds of goals are probably a lot rarer than the approach taken by most textbooks indicates. I suspect that most of us teaching in colleges here are ultimately involved with teaching a different kind of writing from this limited ESP writing: academic, yes, but reflecting the academy as a place in which writing is intellectually enriching, and is seen, as Mike Rose says, as "complete, active struggling engagement with the facts and principles of a discipline" (1985: 359). In this very engagement, writing is a creative process, creative in terms of topic and language, far removed from just encouraging expression of personal feelings or

exploration of self in journals.

If, then, we decide that we want to combine attention to process and product in our teaching, we will need something more than the textbooks that are uneasy alliances of the two approaches, with journals and freewriting added to the old formulaic abstractions. We want to pay attention to process, but that doesn't mean going all the way and throwing out form, or throwing out grammar or throwing out textbooks. Few of us are ready for such a radical approach and certainly administrators aren't, nor are our students. I'm proposing here a simple sounding principle that will, in its own way, have radical results in what we use and do in the classroom. That principle is this: we will be well on our way to teaching process and product more effectively if we avoid abstractions--models of form and rules of grammar in isolation--and make all our materials and all our activities content-specific. Key words: content-specific. That is, nothing, not grammar, not organization, is done as practice, as an exercise, but it is always related to the content of a specific written product, one written for a real purpose and audience, either one the student reads or one the student writes. If we examine textbooks with this one principle in mind, we will omit exercises about selecting the best topic sentence without seeing the paragraph; we will avoid analyzing artificial paragraphs that were written solely to show a formal principle in

operation; we will not assign pages of exercises on pronouns unless we show the writer how to look for and fix the errors in her own writing. At the same time, we will beware of assigning the so-called "process " activities like journals or freewriting just as an exercise for its own sake, in a vacuum; they should not become mere fluency exercises in the way that controlled compositions are accuracy exercises. Those activities are meaningful to process and to learning when they are part of the context of a written product, when they lead to something and let the writer see what options he or she has.

Options are important. To teach form, organization, and revising, we need to begin with the writer's content, the writer's own ideas, not with a goblet shape or a set of sentences to organize. Otherwise we get what I can only see as teacher-induced rigidities of procedure that block rather than facilitate the generation of ideas. Let me illustrate this: In one of my think-aloud projects, Giovanna's planning consisted of writing an outline that would cover either agreeing with or disagreeing with the proposition that the family influences success in education more than any educational program does. That outline was a classic example of something that was <u>not</u> content-specific. She wrote: Introduction: give an example, main point; Body: a person who doesn't have a family /A person who does have a family; Conclusion: how the main point is supported. She

said afterwards that the outline was for both sides: "I just wanted to write it down for the organization, but I didn't write anything exactly what I was going to write. I just made the outline and I could use it for both sides."

I suspect that Giovanna was the victim of an excess of teaching of form and outlines--abstract outlines, not those that develop out of ideas. She had been taught the form of products, not the processes of writers. One without the other won't do. She needs time to generate ideas, and then work on what formal options are open to her as she prepares her written product. She needs to experience the fact that in writing we are chaotic before we end up being organized. Then she will see that a non-linear recursive process involving pre-writing, planning, organising, and revising can lead to the linearly-organized product of English writing.

We can attend to grammar, too, as part of the process of generating a product, and we can do this in a content-specific way, as well. This means that we don't need to assign our whole class exercises on noun clauses or on articles. Instead, we need to show them how to edit, what to look for, and what to do, not just review the rules and the forms and leave them to it. If we use the textbooks I've examined, we'll get rules, explanations, exhortations, and examples, but we'll have to supply our students with the

strategies they can use.

In summary, the process approach to teaching writing can and should include an approach to the product, to what we saw emphasized in the research: text structure, discourse features, and error. It's just not productive to see teaching as attention to either product or process: writers attend to both, and we should, too. And we are going to have to adapt our textbooks accordingly. In making that adaptation, though, what recent research and theory tell us and our textbooks themselves show us is that attention to the product can be more easily and more felicitously incorporated within a process approach than the other way around.

TESOL Convention
Anaheim, California

Ann Raimes
March 1986

ESL RESEARCH: WRITTEN PRODUCTS

1. L1/L2 text structure

Berman R. 1980. Postposing lexical repetition and the like: A study in contrastive stylistics. Journal of Applied Linguistics 2: 3-25.

Carrell, Patricia. L. 1984. The effects of rhetorical organization on ESL readers. TESOL Quarterly 18, 3: 441-470.

Connor, Ulla, and Peter McCagg. 1983. Cross-cultural differences and perceived quality in written paraphrases of English expository prose. Applied Linguistics 4,3: 259-268.

Dehghanpisheh, Elaine. 1978. Language development in Farsi and English: Implications for the second language learner. IRAL 16, 1: 45-61.

Hinds, John. 1983. Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English.Text 3, 2: 183-195.

Kaplan, Robert B. 1966. Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. Language Learning 16, 1: 1-20.

Kaplan, Robert B. 1983. Contrastive rhetorics: Some implications for the writing process. In Learning to write: First language/Second language, I. Pringle et al. (Eds.), 139-161. London: Longman.

Kaplan, Robert B. (Ed.). 1983. Annual review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 3. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

2. Rhetorical structure of scientific writing

Lackstrom, John, Larry Selinker, and Louis P.Trimble. 1973. Technical rhetorical principles and grammatical choice. TESOL Quarterly 7, 2: 127-133.

Selinker, Larry, Mary Todd-Trimble, and Louis Trimble. 1976. Presuppositional rhetorical information in ESL discourse. TESOL Quarterly 10, 3: 281-290.

Selinker, Larry, Mary Todd-Trimble, and Louis Trimble. 1978. Rhetorical function-shifts in EST discourse. TESOL Quarterly 12, 3: 311-320.

Weissberg, Robert C. 1984. Given and new: Paragraph development models from scientific English. TESOL Quarterly 18, 3: 485-500.

3. Discourse features

Arapoff, Nancy. 1968. The semantic role of sentence connectors in extra-sentence logical relationships. TESOL Quarterly 2, 4: 243-252.

Carrell, Patricia L. 1979. The given-new strategy: Testing presupposition and assertion in L1 and L2. In On TESOL '78: EFL policies, programs, practices, Charles Blatchford and Jacquelyn Schachter (Eds.), 232--239. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Carrell, Patricia L. 1982. Cohesion is not coherence. TESOL Quarterly 16, 4: 499-488.

Connor, Ulla. 1984. A study of cohesion and coherence in English as a second language students' writing. Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication 17, 3: 301-316.

Grabe, William. 1985. Written discourse analysis. In Annual review of applied linguistics, vol.5, Robert B. Kaplan (Ed.), Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Jacobs, Suzanne E. 1981. Rhetorical information as predication. TESOL Quarterly 15, 3: 237-249.

Scarcella, Robin C. 1984. How writers orient their readers in expository essays: A comparative study of native and non-native English writers. TESOL Quarterly 18, 4: 671-688.

4. Errors

Corder, S. Pitt. 1967. The significance of learners' errors. IRAL 5, 4: 161-170.

Chastain, Kenneth. 1981. Native speaker evaluation of student composition errors. Modern Language Journal 65, 3: 288-294.

Kroll, Barry M. and J. Schafer. 1978. Error analysis and the teaching of composition. College Composition and Communication 29, 3: 242-248.

Lay, Nancy Duke. 1975. Chinese language interference in written English. Journal of Basic Writing 1, 1: 50-61.

Richards, Jack C. (Ed.). 1974. Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition. London: Longman.

Rizzo, Betty and Santiago Villafane. 1975. Spanish influence on written English. Journal of Basic Writing 1, 1: 62-71.

Schachter, Jacquelyn. 1974. An error in error analysis. Language Learning 24, 2: 205-214.

Vann, Roberta J., Daisy E. Meyer, and Frederick O. Lorenz. 1984. Error gravity: A study of faculty opinion of ESL errors. TESOL Quarterly 18, 3: 427-440.

ESL RESEARCH: WRITERS AND THEIR PROCESSES

Edelsky, Carole. 1982. Writing in a bilingual program: the relation of L1 and L2 texts. TESOL Quarterly 16, 2: 211-228.

Jones, C. Stanley. 1983. Attention to rhetorical form while composing in a second language. In Proceedings of the Los Angeles second language research forum, Volume 2, Cherry Campbell, Vanessa Flashner, Thom Hudson, and Jan Lubin (Eds.). Los Angeles: University of California.

Jones, C. Stanley. 1985. Problems with monitor use in second language composing. In Studies on writers' block and other composing process problems, Mike Rose (Ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Jones, C. Stanley and Jacqueline Tetroe. 1986. Composing in a second language. In Writing in real time: modelling the writing process, Ann Matsuhashi (Ed.). New York: Longman.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1984. Writing: Research, theory, and applications. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lay, Nancy Duke. 1982. Composing processes of adult ESL learners: a case study. TESOL Quarterly 16, 3: 406.

Raimes, Ann. 1985. What unskilled ESL students do as they write: a classroom study of composing. TESOL Quarterly 19, 2: 229-258.

Zamel, Vivian. 1982. Writing: the process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly 16, 2: 195-210.

Zamel, Vivian. 1983. The composing processes of advanced ESL students: six case studies. TESOL Quarterly 17, 2: 165-187.

RECENT ESL WRITING TEXTBOOKS

1. Blanton, Linda Lonon. 1983. Intermediate composition practice: Book 2. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

2. Blass, Laurie and Joy Durighello. 1985. From concept to composition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

3. Blass, Laurie and Meredith Pike-Baky. 1985. Mosaic: a content-based writing book. New York: Random House.

4. Cobb, Charles Miguel. 1985. Process and pattern: controlled composition practice for ESL students. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

5. Cramer, Nancy Arapoff. 1985. The writing process: 20 projects for group work. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

6. Hartfiel, V. Faye, Jane B. Hughey, Deanna R. Wormuth, and Holly L. Jacobs. 1985. Learning ESL composition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

7. Kaplan, Robert B. and Peter A Shaw. 1983. Exploring academic discourse. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

8. Reid, Joy M. and Margaret Lindstrom. 1985. The process of paragraph writing. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

9. Smalley, Regina L. and Mary K. Ruetten. 1986. Refining composition skills, 2nd. ed. New York: Macmillan.

10. Tucker, Amy and Jacqueline Costello. 1985. The Random House writing course for ESL students. New York: Random House.

THE APPROACH OF RECENT TEXTBOOKS

Feature examined:	Textbook #
Pre-writing strategies	
Brief reference or no mention	1,4,9
1-2 page introduction or appendix	7,8
Questions about writing	3,6,8
Freewriting	3,5,6
Brainstorming	2,3,5,6
Journal	2,6,10
Systematic coverage of heuristics	6
Revising	
Brief reference or no mention	1,4,7,9
1-2 page checklist	2,8
Peer-group work before revision	3,5,6,10
Teacher input before revision	6
Revision directions with each assignment	3,5,6
Form and Content	
Reading passages as illustration of rhetorical modes and as models of form for imitation, analysis, revision, completion, or manipulation	1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10
- Professional/academic writing samples	2,3,6,7,9,10
- Models prepared especially for this book to illustrate a rhetorical mode	1,3,4,8,9
- Samples and models of student writing	6,8,9,10
Graphic depictions of rhetorical forms	1,3,4,6,7,8
Given content or outline as a basis for writing	1,4,7,8,9

Heuristic guidelines for deciding on organization	3,6
Brief reference or no mention of organization	5

Grammar

In a block:	
Comprehensive coverage, handbook appendix	4
Two introductory chapters (Punctuation and sentence structure)	8
Checklist, + appendix of errors	5
Attached to reading or writing	1,2,3,6,7,9,10